

REMARKS

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action dated February 15, 2008, and the references cited therein. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-24, 26-32 and 34 were previously pending. All the previously pending claims were rejected as either anticipated or obvious over the prior art of record. Applicant submits that the Office Action's current rejection of the presently pending claims is based upon a misapplication of the prior art to at least independent claims 1 and 20, and each claim that recites a first housing and a second housing, since Wilcox US 2002/0090980 does not even remotely suggest Applicant's recited "second housing comprising driving electronics for the display panel." Applicants have amended claims 18 and 19 to include the "second housing" recited in claim 1, and Applicants submit that, in view of the currently submitted amendments to the previously pending claims, all the presently pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record.

Applicant has canceled claims 31 and 32 and added new independent claims 35 and 36. Claim 35 is based upon the disclosure at page 3, lines 11-12 in association with the embodiment disclosed in FIGs. 1a and 1b. Claim 36 is based upon the disclosure at page 5, line 33 to page 6, line 6.

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration of the Office Action's grounds for rejection in view of Applicant's amendments to the previously pending claims and the Remarks provided herein below. Please charge any fee deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 12-1216.

Summary of the Rejections Based on Prior Art

1. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 12-14, 16-24, 27-32 and 34 are rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Wilcox et al. US 2002/0090980 (Wilcox).

2. Claims 11 and 26 are rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wilcox.

Applicant traverses the grounds for each and every rejection for at least the reasons set forth herein below. Applicant addresses the specific rejections in the order they arise in the Office Action.

The Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-9, 12-14, 16-24, 27-32 and 34 as Anticipated by Wilcox

Applicant traverses the rejection of **claims 1 and 20** because Wilcox does not disclose or suggest, to one skilled in the art, the recited display device including at least two housings – a first housing comprising a (replaceable) display panel and a second housing comprising driving electronics for the display panel. Instead, Wilcox discloses a display device including, *if any*, only a *single* housing including the components of Applicant's display device. **Claims 18 and 19** have been amended to recite a display device including first and second housings and are therefore also patentable over Wilcox for at least this reason.

Summary of Applicant's Claimed Invention

The invention recited in **claim 1** comprises an electronic apparatus that displays information via a *display device* including *two distinct housings*. The *display device* is provided with: (1) a first housing (housing 5 in FIG. 4) comprising a display panel, and (2) a second housing (housing part 4 in FIG. 4) comprising driving electronics for the display panel. The display panel is flexible, thereby enabling the panel to be stored within the first housing (e.g., housing 5) when not in use. The two separate housings of the display device facilitate replacing the display panel portion of the display device without having to replace the display device's driver electronics. Thus, the disclosed and claimed invention unequivocally comprises a *display device* having two distinct housings – a first for housing a display panel and a second for housing display driver electronics. See, FIG. 4, Applicant's specification at page 5, lines 20 et seq.

Summary of the Cited Wilcox Reference

Wilcox, in contrast to the claimed invention, describes a display device for an electronic apparatus that includes, *if any*, a *single display device* housing. The only housing explicitly recited in Wilcox is the *cell phone* housing which does not *house* the attached flexible external screen 24. Instead, when not in use, the screen 24 is folded against the cell phone's housing. See, FIG. 2. When in use, the screen 24 is supported by a frame including support members 32, 34 and 36 (referred to in the Office Action as a "housing"). However, no reference in fact is made to any *housing* for the screen 24 or associated display driver electronics even though Wilcox

previously used such term to describe a case containing cell phone electronics. Wilcox simply does not have a housing for the external screen 24 or its associated drivers and/or controller.

The Invention Recited in Claim 1 is Not Anticipated by Wilcox

The Office Action has not provided a *prima facie* case of anticipation since each of the recited elements of claim 1 is not disclosed in Wilcox. Wilcox does not disclose or suggest either one of Applicant's recited first housing and second housing for a display device (for an electronic apparatus including a further display device). Instead, Wilcox discloses an external screen that is stored by folding the screen and restraining it against a side of the cell phone device. The only disclosed housing is the cell phone housing which does not form any part of the claimed display device.

The Office Action incorrectly applies Wilcox's disclosure to the first and second housing elements of Applicant's claim 1. The Office Action asserts that *support member 32* in Wilcox corresponds to Applicant's recited *first housing* that houses the display panel. Support member 32 is no more than a support structure and does not exhibit container-like traits of the claimed first housing. The Office Action asserts that *support member 32* also corresponds to the *second housing* recited in claim 1. However, applying support member 32 to Applicant's recited first and second housings disregards Applicant's unequivocal disclosure and recitation of *two distinct housings* for the display device components. Applicant thus submits that Wilcox does not disclose the claimed first and second housings for the display device – in fact no housing is disclosed for the display device.

Applicants traverse the rejection of each of claims **depending from claim 1** for at least the reasons set forth for claim 1 from which each depends.

Applicants furthermore specifically traverse the rejection of **claim 6** since Wilcox does not disclose a mode of operation of the display panel wherein only a portion of the screen is exposed for viewing by a user.

Applicants have amended **claims 18 and 19** to recite the first and second housings. Therefore, claims 18 and 19 are patentable over Wilcox for at least the reasons set forth herein above with regard to claim 1.

Applicants traverse the rejection of independent **claim 20** for at least the reasons set forth herein above with regard to claim 1 since claim 20 too recites a display device including first and second housings that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Wilcox.

Applicants traverse the rejection of the claims depending from **claim 20** for at least the reasons set forth for claim 20 from which each depends.

The Rejection of Claims 11 and 26 As Obvious Over Wilcox

Applicants traverse the rejection of **claims 11 and 26** for at least the reasons set forth herein above with regard to claims 1 and 20 from which each depends.

Applicant respectfully submits that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Joy, Reg. No. 35,562
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: June 16, 2008